UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/542,899	01/17/2006	David C Dressel	1216-04302	8372	
23505 CONLEY ROS	7590 04/17/200 E, P.C.	EXAMINER			
David A. Rose	,	TYLER, STEPHANIE E			
P. O. BOX 3267 HOUSTON, TX 77253-3267			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				3754	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/17/2009	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

pathou@conleyrose.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/542,899	DRESSEL ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	STEPHANIE E. TYLER	3754				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 Ja	anuary 2009					
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	action is non-final.					
	<u> </u>					
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
	·					
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	••				

Application/Control Number: 10/542,899 Page 2

Art Unit: 3754

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lundsgaard et al. (3,886,971).

The Lundsgaard et al. reference discloses the system and method thereof having a first fluid (106) supplying a first stream (fig.1) of a first fluid in a first supply line; a first flow divider (at end of first fluid supply line; see fig.1) splitting the first stream into primary and secondary streams (see streams in fig.1); a second fluid supply (107) supplying a second fluid in a second supply line; a second flow divider (at end of second fluid supply line; see fig.1) splitting said second stream into primary and secondary streams (see streams in fig.1); a first mix head (108) combining the primary stream (fig.1) of the first fluid with the primary stream of the second fluid; and wherein including at least one recycle line (any one stream connected back to fluid supply; see fig.1) from at least one flow divider (at end of first fluid supply line; see fig.1) to at least one of the fluid supplies. Since Lundsgaard et al. already discloses one mix head, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to try implementing a second mix head in an attempt to provide a way to dispense more mixture of contents simultaneously and effectively same time when dispensing such contents from apparatus.

The initial statement of intended use and all other functional implications have been carefully considered but are deemed not to impose any patentably distinguishing structure over that disclosed by Lundsgaard et al. which is capable of being used in the intended manner, i.e., layer of foam/froth foam and/or layer of froth foam (see M.P.E.P. 2111).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The Harnoncourt (3,712,325), Zinsmeyer (5,018,645), Mitchell (2,830,618), Gladstone et al. (3,411,537) and Kumpman (2,847,027) are other various types of mixing systems.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to STEPHANIE E. TYLER whose telephone number is (571)272-8059. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached on 571-272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/542,899 Page 4

Art Unit: 3754

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. E. T./ Examiner, Art Unit 3754

/Kevin P. Shaver/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3754